IMT Nuremberg Archives

H – 681

International Court of Justice

H0681 – 0001

H0681 - 0002

Notice.

Not to be published until presented before the tribunal in open court and then only that portion actually submitted as evidence.

Ne pas publier avant présentation devant le tribunal en audience publique et seulement la partie réellement versée au dossier.

Nicht zu veroeffentlichen vor Darlegung vor dem Gericht (Tribunal) in oeffentlicher Sitzung und dann nur jenen Teil, welcher tatsaechlich zur Beweisfuehrung uebermittelt wurde.

Не публиковать до того, как представлено на публичном заседании Трибунала и только ту часть, которая представлена в качестве доказательства.

H0681-0003

I certify that none of the documents included herein have been denied by the Tribunal and that this document book has been examined with the prosecution in accordance with the ruling of the Tribunal dated 4 April 1946.

Je certifie qu'aucun des documents ci-inclus n'a été contesté par le Tribunal, et que ce livre de documents a été examiné par le Ministère Public suivant les règles du Tribunal, en date du 4 Avril 1946.

Ich bestaetige, dass keine der hierin enthaltenen Dokumente vom Gerichtshof abgelehnt wurden und dass dieses Dokumentenbuch gemeinsam mit der Anklagevertretung durchgesehen wurde, in Uebereinstimmung mit der Entscheidung des Gerichtshofes vom 4. April 1946.

Signature of Counsel
Signature de l'Avocat
Unterschrift des Verteidigers.

H0681 - 0004

Table of Contents

of

Document Book III

Baron C. von Neurath

H0681 – 0005

Name of Document	Contents	Date	Neurath No.
2. Documents on the German Foreign Policy.			
	Document Book III		
	Documents 1934-1935		
Ambassador Dodd's Diary	Condemnation of the German Foreign Policy by Ambassador Dodd	1936/37	63
Disarmament and Security, Vol. 2	The German Reply of 19 January 1934 to the French Memorandum of 1 January 1934	19.1.34	64
Contemporary World History in Documents 1934/35	Speech of the Belgian Prime Minister Count Brouqueville in the Senate	6.3.34	66
Disarmament and Security, Vol. 2	The German Memorandum	13.3.34	67
Contemporary World History in Documents 1934/35	Speech of Henderson, the Chairman of the Disarmament Conference, given at a session of the Bureau.	10.4.34.	68
Contemporary World History in Documents 1934/35	Memorandum of the German Reich Government in reply to the English memorandum on disarmaments.	16.4.34.	69

H0681 – 0006

Name of Document	Contents	Date	Neurath No.
Contemporary World History in Documents 1934/35	Excerpt from the Note of the French Government to the British Government	17.4.34.	7o
Contemporary World History in Documents 1934/35	Communique concerning the discussions in Prague of French Foreign Minister Louis Barthou	27.4.34	73
Disarmament and Security Vol. 2	Speech by Reich Foreign Minister Baron v. Neurath delivered before Representatives of the Berlin Press.	27.4.34.	74
Contemporary World History in Documents 1934/35	Speech of the American Plenipotentiary at the Disarmament Conference, Norman Davies.	29.5.34.	76
Contemporary World History in Documents 1934/35	Excerpt from the Speech of the French Foreign Minister Barthou.	3o.5.34.	77

H0681 - 0007

Name of Doc.	Contents	Date	No.
Contemporary World History in Documents 1934/35	Excerpt from the Statement made by the Minister of War, Marshal Petain, before the Military Committee of the Chamber, concerning the Supreme Leadership in War.	6-6-34	78
"European Politics 1933/38 as Reflected by the Prague Documents" Dr. Berber	Report of the Czecho-Slovakian Envoy to Paris	15-6-34	79
Contemorary World History in Documents 1934/35	Address delivered by the German Reich Chancellor Adolf Hitler, at the "Gau" meeting in Gera	17-6-34	80
Contemporary World History in Documents 1934/35	Excerpt from the speech of the Czechoslovakian Foreign Minister Benesch concerning the European situation, delivered before the Chamber	2-7-34	81
Contemporary World History in Documents 1934/35	A Proclamation in favor of total Military Training	22-7-34	82
Contemporary World History in Documents 1934/35	Communique of the German Reich Cabinet	26-7-34	83
Letter	Baron v. Neurath to the Ministerial Director Dr. Kroepke	28-7-34	84
Contemporary World History in Documents 1934/35	Communique of the German Reich Cabinet regarding its attitude towards the Eastern Pact.	10-9-34	85
Contemporary World History in Documents 1934/35	Speech of the Reich Minister of Foreign Affairs Baron von Neurath	17-9-34	86

H0681-0008

Name of Doc.	Contents	Date	Neurath No.
Contemporary World History in Documents 1934/35	The Admission of the Soviet-Union into the League of Nations.	18-9-34	87
Contemporary World History in Documents 1934/35	Excerpts from a Speech by General Smuts before the Royal Institute of International Affairs.	12-11-34	88
Contemporary World History in Documents 1934/35	Statement of the Reporter of the Committee of the Army of the French Chamber on the Entante with Russia.	23-11-34	89
Disarmament and Security Vol.2	Franco-Russian Protocol of the East Pact Negotiations	5-12-34	91
Contemporary World History in Documents 1934/35	Appeal of the President of the Czechoslovak Republic Masaryk to the Armed Forces.	28-12-34	92
Contemporary World History in Documents 1934/35	Excerpt from a Speech of the Deputy Commissioner for War M.N. Tuchatschewsky at the VII. All-Russian Congress of Councillors.	30-1-35	93 No document
Contemporary World History in Documents 1934/35	Excerpt from a Speech of the French Prime Minister Flandin before the Chamer	5-2-35	94
Contemporary World History in Documents 1934/35	Reply of the Reich Cabinet to the London Communique	12-2-34	95

H0681 – 0009

Name of Doc.	Contents	Date	Neurath No.
Disarmament and Security, Vol. 2	Statement by the French Government	15-3-35	96
Contemporary World History in Documents 1934/35	Excerpt from an Appeal of the German Reich Cabinet for the Reestablishment of German Compulsory Military Service	16-3-35	97
Contemporary World History in Documents 1934/35	Communique of the German Reich Cabinet	18-3-35	98
Contemporary World History in Documents 1934/35	Communique on the Conference of the English Foreign Minister Simon and Lord Privy Seal Eden with the German Reich Government	26-3-35	99
Disarmament and Security, Vol. 2	The Franco-Russian Assistance Pact	2-5-35	101
Contemporary World History in Documents 1934/35, Vol.3	Communique on the Conference of the French Foreign Minister Laval in Moscow	15-5-35	102
Disarmament and Security	The Czecho-Russian Assistance Pact	16-5-35	103
Contemporary World History in Documents 1934/35	From the Speech of the Fuehrer Hitler on the Franco-Russian Pact	21-5-35	104

H0681-0010

Name of Doc.	Contents	Date	Neurath No.
Contemporary World History in Documents 1935/36, Vol. 3	Note of the Reich Cabinet to the Signatory Powers to the Locarno Pacts	25-5-35	105
Disarmament and Security, Vol.2	Statement of the First Lord of the Admiralty Monsell over the British Radio.	19-6-34	106

H0681 - 0011

Filed in evidence

Neurath No. 63

Defense Exhibit No...

Excerpts from

"Ambassador Dodd's Diary"

1933/1937

H0681-0012

Neurath Nr. 63

Defense Exhibit No.....

filed June 2nd

From

"The Ambassador Dodd's Diary"
1933/1937

p. 62. (conversation with Hitler about disarmament;)
October 17,1933
I replied: "There is evident injustice in the French attitude; but defeat in war is always followed by injustice."

p. 65.
October 26,1933
French politicians have for ten years violated the spirit of the disarmament clauses of the Versailles Treaty. The German Social-Democratic movement was ruined by French policy. Now, after the German Nazi uprising in protest, the Germans are trying to govern themselves by autocratic methods, alienating the world by their indiscretions and forcing unanimous world dislike. Wrong and right are so mixed and confused everywhere.

p. 114 (discussion with v. Neurath)
May 28.,1934
von Neurath dwelt some time on the unfortunate attitude of France. "If they would only meet us part way, we would gladly resume negotiations at Geneva. I think that it would be one of the greatest things in the world if France would yield;"

p. 240 (conc. a conversation of British Embassy Counseller Newton with v. Neurath about the Stresa conference) April 12,1935
von Neurath replied, to Newton's surprise, that Germany would approve or at least not oppose, any peaceful treaty. This was telegraphed to Stresa. While this surprised the French not a little, it did not surprise me, since I have repeatedly been told by the Foreign Office people that Germany would return to the League of Nations whenever other powers agreed to recognize her equal rights."

---

copy certified by:

.....
(Dr. Frhr. v. Luedinghausen
Attorney-at-law

H0681-0013

Filed June 22

Neurath No. 64

Defense Exhibit No...

The German reply of 19 January 1
to the French memorandum of
1 January 1934

(Quoted from: "Disarmament and
Security by Dr. K. Schwendeman,
Volume 2, Pages 569 to 582)

II.

When one realizes the main points of the French plan and its consequences, as it happened under present circumstances, there arise serious doubts, as to the possibility of finding in that way a solution of the disarmament problem which is equally compatible with the sense of justice and the safeguarding of the peace. All things considered, the present status of the problem still appears to the German Government in the same light as some months ago, when it saw itself compelled to leave the League of Nations and the disarmament conference due to the failure of Geneva's methods and decided upon a new proposal. The German Government most decidedly regrets that the French Government has disregarded in its memorandum the point of departure in this proposal. Not because it wanted to give up the idea of disarmament and demand the armament of Germany instead, did the German Government make its proposal. I must emphasize repeatedly and forcefully that Germany wants nothing more urgently than the most extensive universal disarmament possible. The German Government would always consider it as the best solution if all nations were to reduce their armament in accordance with the disarmament provided for in the Versailles treaty. In this way the question of Germany's equality would also find its simplest solution. In any case, there is no measure, however extensive, in the realm of quantitative or qualitative disarmament, which Germany is not prepared to accept immediately provided it would be carried out in a similar manner by all other countries. This unequivocal and often repeated declaration alone gives the German Government the right to repudiate vigorously the assertion that the exclusive aim of its policy is the rearmament of Germany. When the German Government's proposal went so far as to find a speedy and early solution on the basis of limiting the armaments of highly armed states according to their present armament, this was only because it was convinced that the course of the negotiations of almost eight years has clearly shown that the highly armed powers, who are principally involved, are not prepared at the present time, for whatever reasons, for a really decisive disarmament.

H0681 - 0014

H0681 - 0015

The memorandum of 1 January also does not contemplate such a disarmament. Obviously, however, it is not in the spirit of the German proposal to disregard at present even such separate disarmament measures upon which an agreement appears possible. On the contrary, nothing would be more welcome to the German Government than to establish the most extensive armament limitations possible in the settlement suggested by itself. These, however, as the state of affairs still appears to the German Government, will in no way reach such a degree that Germany's equality of rights, as expressed in the declaration of 11 December 1932, would be achieved without further effort. If one faces this reality then, in order to reach an early settlement at all, there is no other way out than to establish only disarmament measures on which an agreement seems possible at present, but to limit the armaments of the highly armed states to their present status for the duration of the first agreement and to establish Germany's parity by adjusting her armaments to a certain degree to the armament level of other nations. This proposal has no other aim than to draw conclusions from a situation which has been admitted once and for all and for which Germany is not to blame. It cannot possibly be expected that Germany should alone bear the consequences of this situation to the extent that she would still be subjected for years to one-sided armament limitations, which are not binding on other nations, to whose armament level they stand in no proportion whatsoever

H0681-0016

(Lines 40 - end)

The French Government cannot fail to realize that what the German Government feels forced to claim now in this respect is far less than would have to be granted to Germany in case of a truly complete equalization of Germany's rights. Even if the future German Army with short term service will be 300,000 strong and will obtain some needed defense weapons at the same time as the conversation of the Reichswehr into a new army type, France and the other strongly armed countries will still maintain an enormous advantage in regard to armaments. Under these circumstances, declining Germany's demands could only mean that one does not really intend to grant equality of rights to Germany.

H0681-0017

Exhibit Neurath No. 66

Speech of the Belgian Prime Minister Count Brouqueville on 6 March 1934 in the Senate.

(quoted from "Contemporary World History in Documents" 1934/1935, Part I, Page 20. Essen, 1936.)

H0681-0018

I feel not less than you the bitterness of the present situation; it is the result of a great illusion shared by men, who, disregarding the lessons of history and reality, believed they could keep a great nation in a state of disarmament for an indefinite time. How could one imagine that 27 nations, who were by chance "allied and associated" at that moment, would hold together also in the future in order to impose upon Germany, whose ultimate unity was approved by the Versailles Treaty, what Napoleon, the almighty master of two thirds of Europe, was unable to force upon the little kingdom of Prussia?

We must bury that illusion.

Who ever witnessed the survival of such decisions over the conditions under which they originated?

The Germany of today is no more the conquered Germany of 11 November 1918. And where on the other side is the common will of the 27 Allies, who signed the Treaty of 1919? It is the inevitable law of history, that sooner or later the one conquered rises again.

H0681-0019

Filed June 22

Neurath No. 67

Defense Exhibit No.

The German memorandum of 13 March 1934 (quoted from: "Disarmament and Security" by Dr.K.Schwendeman Volume 2, pages 591 - 597)

H0681-0020

(Lines 7 - 18)

The German Government has imposed upon itself such extensive limitations in the proposals finally made at the first Disarmament Convention regarding the armament standards of Germany, that it has reached the very minimum of what is compatible in this era with the ability of the country to safeguard and defend itself. From the very start it renounced all aggressive weapons, and always declared it would accept further armament limitations however extensive, provided the other powers would do the same. Moreover, the German Government takes for granted all presuppositions for an understanding, being of the opinion, that the whole question depends only on the determination to come to this understanding.

H0681 - 0021

Exhibit

Neurath No.68

Speech of Henderson, the President of the Disarmament Conference, given at the session of the Bureau, on 10 April 1934.

(Quoted from "Contemporary World History in Documents" 1934/35. Part I, Page 23) Essen, 1936.

H0681 - 0022

(Lines 6-33)

Exhibit Neurath No. 68

- - - - - - -

Three years ago the Council of the League of Nations at its May session unanimously asked me to accept the chairmanship of the Disarmament Conference. For 26 months I have held this office with faith and devotion, though my health during this time left much to be desired. Despite some stormy clouds looming in the Far East at this time, the opening of our conference was encouraging and filled with hope. The peace-loving populations in every country experienced a strong revival of their enthusiasm and hope. There was a general conviction that we were about to open a new era by the realization of a world agreement for reduction and limitation of armaments, that article 8 of the League of Nation's Charter would at last be applied and that the nations would experience an effective reduction of their unproductive military burdens which they have had to bear so long. Everywhere the impression prevailed that disarmament had become a question of immediate urgency and of highest import. It seemed at last that the governments were willing to permit their promises, so frequently and so solemnly pronounced, to be followed by actions and that this peace, so urgently demanded by the nations, would at last be given to them.

Under such promising circumstances we began on 2 February 1932 our endeavors to bring about a world wide agreement for reduction and limitation of armaments. What is the situation today? In almost all great countries expenditures for armaments are beginning to grow. A new armament race has already begun, though not yet on a large scale. That is the way the situation looks now!

H0681-0023

(Lines 11-23)

The pressure of public opinion and the wise statesmanship of the governments, who are bound to arrive at a general agreement regarding reduction and limitation of armaments, are able to transform the momentarily serious crisis into a great opportunity for success. It is our holy duty to bring this conference to a conclusion in harmony with our treaty obligations and our former decisions, for only with such a conclusion could we stop the trend toward a new armament race and put an end to the growing danger of war.

H0681 - 0024

Neurath No.69

Defense Exhibit No.

Filed June 2

Reminder of the Germ Reich Government of 16 April 1934 in reply to the English memorandum on disarmament.

(Quoted from : Contemporary World History in Documents 1934/35 Part I, page 26.)

H0681 – 0025

Neurath No. ..69.....
Defense Exhibit No. ....

The German Government is prepared to accept the United Kingdom's memorandum of 29 January 1934 as basis for a convention, with the proviso, however, of certain important modifications.

The German Government considers it impossible to wait two years for adequate means of air defense. It wishes to possess from the start of the convention a defensive air fleet of short range planes not including any bombers. The proportional strength of this air fleet would not exceed 30 percent of the combined fighting air force of Germany's neighbors or 50 percent of France's air force (i.e. those which she has in France proper and in her North African possessions) - depending on which number is smaller.

This demand is brought forth by the German Government without prejudice for the results of the investigation of the air problem proposed in the United Kingdom's memorandum which would take place as proposed and at least should outlaw bombing planes. Germany demands no military planes in excess of that number during the first five years of a convention valid for ten years, but after those five years she demands that the necessary reductions and increases should be undertaken, so that at the end of the convention valid for ten years, full numerical equality with the principal air powers would be attained.

The German Government would be prepared on the basis of reciprocity to agree to the establishment of the further regulations to safeguard the non-militar character of the SA and SS, presented by the Reich Chancellor to Mr. Eden on 21 February, by which this non-military character would be supervised by control system.

These regulations would establish that the SA and the SS:

1) possess no arms,
2) are not trained in the use of arms,
3) are not assembled and trained in military camps,
4) are not trained either directly or indirectly by officers of the regular army,
5) are not permitted to undertake or participate in field manouvers.

Furthermore the German Government is prepared to agree that the reduction in armaments of the other powers should be postponed to the end of the fifth year of the convention so that the disarmament measures, provided in the United Kingdom's memorandum would be carried out only during the last five years of the convention. All other proposals made in the United Kingdom's memorandum, insofar as they are not affected by these modifications, as for instance those regarding control, are accepted by the German Government. The German Government further also recognizes the Locarno treaties. It is of the opinion that the return of Germany into the League of Nations should be discussed only after a solution of the disarmament problem and above all, of the problem of her equality of rights.

H0681-0026

Filed June 22, 1946

Neurath No.70

Defense Exhibit No.

Excerpt from the Note of the French Government to the British Government dated 17 April 1934.

(Quoted from " Contemporary World History in Documents ")
(Weltgeschichte der Gegenwart in Dokumenten)
1934/35 Part I, Page 28.

H0681-0027

They prove that the Reich Cabinet - intentionally or not - has rendered impossible discussions the basis of which were ruined through its initiative. This statement dictates to the French Republic its duty and its reply. Before making any statement as to whether it is possible to come to an accord concerning a system of guarantees for execution which would be sufficiently effective to permit the signing of an agreement which would legalize German considerable rearmament, France must first of all consider the conditions of her own security, from which - by the way - she does not divorce the securit of other powers concerned.

However, Mr. Eden was not able to bring from Berlin a favorable solution concerning this important question and the silence, observed in the last communiques, do not permit any better hope. The French Government for its part cannot on principle give up an essential and necessary condition placed by it into the foreground.

H0681 - 0028

It is even more impossible for it to take the responsibility for such a dangerous renunciation in this hour, in which the German rearmament is intensified and hastily developed, without taking into consideration the negotiations entered upon in accordance with Germany's desires.

(Page 200
of orig.)

Filed June 27

Neurath No.73

Defense Exhibit No.

Communique' of 27 April 1934 concerning the discussions in Prague of French Foreign Minister Louis Bartou.

(Quoted from " Contemporary World History "
- Weltgeschichte der Gegenwart - 1934/35 Part I, Page 169

H0681 - 0029

H0681-0030

Neurath No.

Defense Exhibit No.

Communique' of 27 April 1934 concerning the discussions in Prague of French Foreign Minister Louis Bartou.

During the three long discussions which took place between Minister Bartou and the Czech Foreign Minister Dr. Benesch on 26 and 27 April, the two foreign ministers examined all current problems of international politics. Particularly the problem of Central Europe and that of economic collaboration of the Danubian countries among each other and with the other countries interested, was the subject of an exhaustive interchange of ideas. Both ministers stated their complete agreement. They confirmed the decisions made by their governments in respect to this affair which they set forth in their recent declarations, especially the decisions concerning the Rome conventions.

The other questions, particularly the Balkan agreement and its significance, the policy of the Little Entente, the problems of the League of Nations and especially the whole disarmament problem from the point of view of the impending meeting of the conference for the reduction and limitation of armaments, were particularly taken into consideration.

The general examination of the relationship of the countries of the Little Entente towards their neighbors and towards France made it possible for the two ministers who exchanged their information to harmonize their actions for the purpose of collaboration in Central and Eastern Europe.

Mr. Benesch and Mr. Bartoun could congratulate one another for the happy results of their friendly conversation which were carried out in complete agreement.

(Quoted from "Contemporary World History in Documents-
Weltgeschichte der Gegenwart in Dokumenten"
1934/35 Part I, Page 169)

Filed June 27, 1946

Neurath No. 74

Defense Exhibit No.....

SPEECH BY REICHMINISTER OF FOREIGN
AFFAIRS FREIHERR VON NEURATH
DELIVERED BEFORE REPRESENTATIVES
OF THE BERLIN PRESS ON APRIL 27, 193

(quoted from "DISARMAMENT AND SECURI
by Dr. K.Schwendemann
Vol. II, pp.616-626)

H0681 - 0031

H0681-0032

pp. 616-626

Neurath No. 74
Defense Exhibit No.

Speech by Reich Minister of Foreign Affairs Freiherr von Neurath delivered before representatives of the Berlin Press on April 27, 1934:

I have asked you to come here to inform you on a few points of view and to discuss them with you, matters which impress me as important for an evaluation of the present state of the question of disarmament. As you all know, the Fren Government by its new Note to the British Government has created a complete change in the recent political development. The negotiations which had been ca on among the major interested powers for more than six months have been brough to an abrupt end by France and it was done with a motivation that contains the most serious accusations against Germany. It is obvious that we cannot remain silent after such a turn of things. Before our own people and before the world public we have the duty to say frankly what we think about this new diplomatic document which in its statements is concerned almost exclusively with Germany, and als what we think about the situation created by it. However, I hardly consider it necessary to refute each and every one of the attacks and reproach directed against Germany in the French Note. Surely, it is easy to see and cer tainly it has been recognized not only in Germany that the real reasons for the momentous decision of the French Government are based on other facts than the figures of our army budget now criticized. Everyone who is prepared to se things naturally and simply must be amazed that a government whose own defense expenditures last year amounted to more than 16,000,000,000 Marks should cry out in alarm when the neighboring country has a defense budget of 890,000,000 Marks. Isn't it puzzling that the French Government brandmarks this year's increase of about 220,000,000 Marks as a threat to peace though the largest part of that sum has been set aside for exactly that transformation of our Reichswe which France has demanded? Isn't it true that France herself, inspite of the disarmament negotiations currently in progress, has repeatedly increased its defense expenditures by leaps and bounds? And should it possible that a power the most prodigious military air force of the world and which supports with largest means its own highly developed civil aviation should really be concer about Germany's having set aside for the protection of its civilian population by special local installations against hostile air attacks 50 million and in addition 160 millions Marks for the re-organization of civil aviation which had b en neglected for years. Such comparisons are bound to make every German realize again the fact that even today, fifteen years after the conclusion of the Versailles Treaty and eight years after taking up disarmament negotiations, it is considered possible and permissible to apply to Germany what we so often had to reject as two different standards.

If the French Government now uses a fact so irrelevant to the point of view of foreign policy as figures of our defense budget as an occasion for the seri decision of interrupting most important diplomatic negotiations, it is very su able to recall earlier experiences we had in regard to French disarmament policy. More than once France has chosen in the Disarmament Conference and in diplomatic negotiations to postulate certain demands as pre-requisites which

H0681 - 0033

always resulted in the prevention of positive decisions in the real questions of disarmament. All of us know the part which was played in this respect by the general problem of security in its various forms, the question of so-called para-military formations, the question of control and similar things, simultaneously and one after the other. Whenever any of these questions was cleared, substantially because of German concessions, as a rule another one took its place. When recently a new problem raised by France was brought up for discussion, that of the guarantees for the carrying out of the disarmament convention, the French Government not even waited for the other powers to state their viewpoints but broke off negotiations and demanded our return to Geneva. By doing so it destroyed with one blow the result of difficult negotiations which had led step by step to a definition and clarification of concrete and essential problems and which had made an early agreement seem very likely. Such an action must amaze even more since the French Government in its most recent communication to the German Government, a memorandum dated 14 February, had almost emphatically expressed its desire to continue negotiations with Germany and since nothing has actually been done by the German Government since that time about the disarmament question except that we made our concessions on the individual points under discussion. more concrete. One only has to compare the statement of the English Government of 16 April which was recently published and which briefly summarized the last German position, with the French note to England published shortly thereafter in order to recognize that Germany's conduct did not present one sound reason for the sudden withdrawal from the negotiations.

For it is much more important to realize the principal meaning of the French point of view. It amounts to the fact that the treatment of the disarmament question is entirely up to the highly armed countries, that Germany, however, has to wait patiently for what they decide and that she herself then had no right to demand or to do anything if the other powers continue to negotiate without results for another two or five or ten years after the eight futile years which have already gone by. I openly admit that I did not think it possible for a Government to advance such a thesis at the present state of affairs and in view of the entire way in which we have conducted the negotiations with them. But it has happened and there is nothing left for us to do but to characterize this thesis with all sharpness and precision for what it is: it simply upsets the entire basis of the disarmament question not only legally but also politically and historically.

The signatory powers are not today and have not been for a long time at liberty to act in the disarmament question arbitrarily and as they please. In the treaty of 1919 they did not leave this problem to free discussion among the nations as " res integra " but instead gave it its concrete form by forcing the central powers on one hand to disarm completely and by establishing by treaty on the other hand, this extraordinary measure as a first step towards bringing about general disarmament. The obligations of the central powers and above all of Germany have been fulfilled to the last letter of the treaty. The long overdue return obligation, namely the carrying out of general disarmament has not been fulfilled at all and nowheres are there any signs that it will be effected within a reasonable space of time. That is the real basis of the disarmament problem as it is under discussion today. Something else must be added here. It has taken enough time until the Disarmament Conference was called at last. But it finally has been called and as fruitless as its negotiations have been, one thing has been clarified at least with regard to the thesis which is now so popular in France, and recognised by all parties, namely that a continuation of this state of unilateral disarmament of Germany amidst neighbors which are highly armed and not subject to any limitations in their future armament measures, would constitute a flagrant violation of the law and a political impossibility. Germany could consider remaining with the armament regime forced upon her in Versailles only if the other powers decided to lower their armaments to the same level, and this was indeed the original demand made by the German delegation at the Disarmament Conference. But this demand has been rejected categorically and since that time the negotiations as far as Germany was concerned could only revolve around the question in which other manner the German equality of rights could be achieved. T is was finally laid down specifically and in binding form- even though after serious arguments- in the well known Five-Power-Declaration of December 1932 and has been confirmed in the disarmament negotiations as even though they yielded no results otherwise.

If one wants to judge according to purely formal legal principles, one should ask oneself the question who is more justified, whether France when advocating the thesis of her last note or Germany when she wanted to insist now on seeing her equality of rights realized at once and without limitations to an extent which would be in accordance with the armament level of the highly armed nations, above all that of France ?
Germany did not make this claim. It is true, she did adhere to the principle of equality of rights and to its realization as the future final objective but has agreed in sober and expedient political evaluation of the given conditions to accept for the first disarmament convention a regime which realizes only an extremely moderate part of that final objective. We have upheld this moderate viewpoint even at a time when it became increasingly evident that any material disarmament measures on the part of the highly armed countries especially of France, could not be counted upon. From the very start we renounced the possession of all attack weapons. We have declared

H0681 - 0034

that we would accept for Germany any armament limitations however far reaching they may be, if the same were accepted by the other powers. We have therefore left it to the decision of the other powers to determine what types of weapons would be generally admitted in the future. In the especially important question of rearmament we have made - as is evident from the already mentioned statement of the British Government - the most far reaching concessions also with regard to the quantity of our demands. Besides we have agreed to the introduction of an effective control a. d have offered all imaginable sorts of guarantees in order to guarantee the non-military character of the political organizations in Germany.

Can it be understood at all in the light of these widely known facts that in the last French Note the reproach was made that Germany wanted to force her decision upon the other powers to continue her rearmement in all fields and in a measure to be determined by her alone? Last fall we had to quit the Geneva Conference because the Geneva methods had proved completely unsuited for the solution of the problem and because one made the impossible demand from us to subject Germany to a probation period of several years before the realization of her equality of rights was to be started. However, immediately afterwards we directed all our efforts to coming to an agreement in special negotiations with the powers concerned with regard to the main question of the disarmament problem in order to create a basis for the reaching of a general agreement which would be acceptable to all countries. In these special negotiations during which we put our cards on the table from the very beginning we have finally gone to the extreme limit of what could yet be reconciled to our vital interests in order to bring about an accord.

Even now we are at all times prepared to come to an understanding. Only recently, as you know, has the President of the Reich appointed a special Plenipotentiary for Disarmament Questions for the purpose of facilitating and demanding international negotiations. It has never been our goal to solve the future German armament regime simply by unilateral decisions and measures. The Reich Government always has been and still is aware of the fact how much benefit the restoration of confidence and the political and economic future of all nations would derive from an agreement on the disarmament problem. We, therefore, continue to wish that an agreement be brought about in the near future. No government, however, can be expected to make the security and the fate of its country dependent on the arbitrary will and opinion of other countries for a given length of time. We will stand by all the proposals and concessions as we have last made them. All those assertions which claim that we had decided not only upon defensive weapons but on equipment with attack weapons I relegate decidedly to the realm of the fable. The decision on our proposals and concessions rests no longer with us but with the other powers. After the French Government has obstructed by its sudden decision the road which we have taken and which alone is practical in our opinion, it is not up to us to open it anew.

H0681-0035

The Reich Government has done everything in its power to create all prerequisites for this. It has not only announced its unconditional desire for peace in its political program but has proved it by its actions. The satisfactory solution of the relations with Poland brought about by it, its professed faith in the Locarno Pacts, its willingness to conclude the most far readhing non-aggression pacts with all neighboring states and its conciliatory attitude towards all proposals submitted to it up to now in the field of the security question, furnish irrefutable proof for the way in which we want to pursue the interests of our country. The time of the ultimatums, dictates and unilateral settlements against Germany, however, has passed. But the guarding of Germany's vital interests as we understand them and have set ourselves as task, is in full accord with the common European interests. Only a Germany safe against all attacks can fulfill the peace function which she has in the center of Europe. A defenseless Reich would according to all the laws of history finally lead to struggles for power and to the ruin of the continent. May the other governments make use of the great chance which the Reich Government offers them under its strong and safe leadership. Our hand remains extented for an agreement and I repeat what I have often stated: It depends only on the decision of the other governments to reach-out for this hand.

(Quoted from: Disarmament and Security, by Dr. K. Schwendemann , Volume 2, pp. 616 - 626)

Copy certified by:

Dr. Frhr. von Lüdinghausen
Attorney-at-Law and Notary

H0681-0036

H0681-0037

Filed June 12, 1946

Neurath No.76

Defense Exhibit No....

Speech of the American Plenipotentiary at the Disarmament Conference, Norman Davies, of 29 May 1934.
(Quoted from "Contemporary World History in Documents" -Weltgeschichte der Gegenwart in Dokumenten- 1934/35 Part I, page 43.)

H0681-0038

Neurath No. 76

Defense Exhibit No.

Speech of the American Plenipotentiary at the Disarmament Conference, Norman Davies, of 29 May 1934.

Expressed in the simplest manner, there are two and only two conceivable means for attaining security. The first exists in an overwhelming armament superiority, perhaps in conjunction with a reinsurance by means of treaties. But this system first led to an armament race and then to war from which we did not recover and from a repetition of which we will never recover again. Weapons neither prevented the world war nor preserved conqueror and defeated from the terrible consequences of that war. The other way consists of a strengthening of the defensive power and a weakening of the offensive power, in other words: Diminish the prospects of a successful war of aggression by means of a progressive removal of that category of weapons which would be needed in case of invasion as for instance heavy mobile artillery, tanks, gas and bomber aircraft. This method of disarmament not only prevents complicatidns arising from a numerical limitation and reduction of armaments only, but represents a real aid for peace not only through therreduction of the total amount of war means,but especially by the fact that the actual instruments essential for a successful attack are eliminated and that fortifications and defensive means predominate. As a matter of fact, this method has been adopted by the conference in the resolution of 23 July 1932.....

H0681-0039

Neurath No.77

Defense Exhibit No.

Excerpt from the Speech of the French Foreign

Minister Louis Barthou30 May 1934

(Quoted from " Contemporary World History

in Documents " 1934/35 Part 1, Page 53,3rd par.)

H0681 - 0040

Neurath No. 71

Defense Exhibit No.

Excerpt from the Speech of the French Foreign Minister Louis Barthou, 30 May 1934.

Sir John Simon proposed solutions, i.e. some solutions. Among them there is not a single one for which I refuse my collaboration and he can count upon my full agreement. Besides his practical conclusions, however, which are more or less important, his speech contains an idea which dominates everything else : that of security.
For my part I draw the following conclusion from it : it is maintained that this conference is unnecessary since no precise propositions have been submitted to it. I declared that I will adhere to French policy and to the memorandum of 1 January which is well formulated indeed. I said that I will not reject any suggestion. But I also said that the idea of security has considerably advanced yesterday. Today its principle is adopted as one can no longer avoid it.

(Quoted from " Contemporary World History in Documents " 1934/35 Part 1, Page 53,3rd par.)

Copy certified by :

Signed : Frhr.v Luedinghausen
Attorney-at-law and Notary

H0681 - 0041

Neurath No. 78

Defense Exhibit No.

Excerpt from the Statement Made by the Minister of War, Marshal Petain, before the Military Committee of the Chamber, on 6 June 1934 Concerning the Supreme Leadership in the War.

(Quoted from "Contemporary World History in Documents" 1934/35, Part I, Page 392)

H0681 - 0042

Neurath No. 78

Defense Exhibit No...

Excerpt from the Statement Made by the Minister of War, Marshal Petain, before the Military Committee of the Chamber on 6 June 1934, Concerning the Supreme Leadership in War.

Together with some of my colleagues I appeared yesterday before a committee which we were supposed to inform about the industrial mobilization. Naturally we discussed many subjects, particularly the most different kinds of metals, the supply of gasoline, coal and iron, in short all sorts of subjects. At an appropriate occasion the chairman of the Committee, namely Mr. Caillaux, asked me: "But who shall coordinate all this? I answered him the following: So far as industry and commerce are concerned the coordination must be accomplished by the Supreme Council for National Defense which includes the whole Cabinet and over which the Prime Minister presides. A general secretariate is appointed which - under the direction of a general secretary - takes care of the preliminary work.

Furthermore it is necessary to coordinate the different branches of the Armed Forces. Who shall carry out this coordination? Again the Prime Minister. For this task, the Supreme Committee for War has been appointed, which committee includes, as Mr. Messimy mentioned already, the three Ministers for National Defense with their Chiefs of Staff.

Third, care must be taken to achieve unity of the actual conduct of war. During the war - Mr. Messimy has just reminded us of it - a very great old man had the supreme leadership, which by the way was limited mainly to the right of controlling, and we know that this leader has accomplished true miracles. In the future this task will again be incumbent upon the Prime Minister. Therefore, he would be: Prime Minister and President of the Supreme Counsel for National Defense; at the same time he would be in charge of coordinating the different branches of the Armed Forces and of controlling the active conduct of war.

Quoted from "Contemporary World History in Documents" in ...

1934/35, Part I, pages 392 to 393)

Copy certified by:

Dr. Frhr. v. Luedinghausen
Attorney-at-Law and Notary

H0681 - 0043

Filed June 24, 1946

Neurath No.79

Defense Exhibit No.

Excerpt from "European Politics 1933/38 as reflected by the Prague Documents" Essen Publishing House, 1941, Page 33, No.28.

H0681-0044

Neurath No. 79

Defense Exhibit No.

" London Fears French-Soviet Alliance ".

Clerk (2) asked Barthou for information concerning France's intentions towards Russia. Leger (3) thinks that Eden did not forward to the Foreign Office everything that Barthou communicated to him in Geneva. The Foreign Office fears that France is preparing a military alliance with Russia ; Leger said that the questions of an alliance are not being discussed but that if the system which was established in Geneva should be ruined, France would look for another one. If England does not desire to see a French-Russian alliance, it should cooperate in the realization of East Locarno.

2)Tyrell's successor as British Ambassador to Paris 1934-37

3)General Secretary of the " Quai d'Orsay" with the title of Ambassador.

(From the report of the Envoy to Paris, Osusky, of 15 July 1934)

Copy certified by

Dr.Frhr.v.Luedinghausen

Attorney-at-Law and Notary

H0681 - 0045

Neurath No.80

Defense Exhibit No.

Addressdelivered by the German Reich Chancellor Adolf Hitler on 17 June 1934 at the "Gau" Meeting in Gera.

(Quoted from "Contemporary World History in Documents") Weltgeschichte der Gegenwart in Dokumenten 1934/35 Part I, Page 63

(Page 217
of orig.)

Neurath No. 80

Defense Exhibit No.

Address delivered by the German Reich Chancellor Adolf Hitler on 17 June 1934 at the Gau meeting in Gera.

A nation has become aware of its power. If the rest of the world attaches to this fact the question: What do you wish to do with it?, then we can answer: At home everything, as far as the outside world is concerned just see to it that you leave us alone. When the question is submitted to me: What do you want to do in order to preserve the peace of the world? I say: We have done our utmost by educating a nation of seventy millions not only in the spirit of self-respect but in the spirit of respect for the rights of others also. May the other statesman and governments also advocate the same spirit, namely to observe not only their own rights but to learn to respect the right of existence of others also.

If someone asks us the question: What do you want to contribute towards the preservation of world peace? Then we say: We are a nation which wants peace and which above all does not concern itself with the affairs of other nations. We have only the desire that the others follow the same line in order to preserve the peace of the world. We are of the opinion that above all the press of all countries should make this contribution towards the preservation of world peace and should not put itself at the disposal of elements which have completely different aims. We National Socialists, we know these international elements very well, we know, who wants peace today and who continuously agitates and continuously excites and poisons the world.

What does it mean that we want to be at peace and in accord with a nation and then we read in its press that one should not come to an understanding with the German Government because that would mean a success for this government. Thus one admits that the German nation would be happy if we could come to an agreement and then nevertheless, one dares to cast suspicion upon this nation in front of the world.

H0681-0046

H0681 - 0047

Filed July 21 1946

Neurath No.81

Defense Exhibit No.81

Excerpt from the Speech of the Czechoslovakian Foreign Minister Benesch concerning the European Situation, delivered on 2 July 1934 before the Chamber.

(Quoted from: "Contemporary World History in Documents" 1934/35 Part 1, page 178)

H0681-0048

Neurath 81
Defense Exhibit No. ...

filed July 2, 1946

Excerpt from a Speech of the Czechoslovakian Foreign Minister Benesch on the European Situation before the Chamber, on 2 July 1934.

The climax of this development is undoubtedly the change which the policy of the Soviet Union has undergone. This change dates fror last year; it came about gradually and assumed definite shape today, at last. In the same measure as the situation in Germany was taking on clear outlines and in the same measure as the events in the Far East progressed -from the Sino-Japanese war, the establishment of the independant state of Manchukuo, the withdrawal of Japan from the League of Nations and her attitude at the Disarmament Conferenc to the tension which at the moment exists between Japan and the Soviet Government-, the Soviet Government has recognized the danger which the latter events constitute for the peace of Europe and the world and likewise the danger which the policy of revolution general represents in Europe and has moved closer to those who want to maintain peace at any price and inspite of all difficulties. At the same time the Soviet Government has begun to appreciate the services which the League of Nations can render to the idea of peace and the stabilization of the present state of things. One has to recall here the speeches by Stalin, Molotov and Kalinin in December 1933 and January 1934 which bring out these facts clearly and which by means of these facts justify the reversal in the policy of the Soviet Union.

The fact is that this reversal has occurred. The tendencies of the present regime in Germany have effected a sort of break between the policies of the two countries. This change and the danger of an impending conflict in the Far East has on one hand drawn Soviet Russia closer to certain European countries, especially to France, and on the other hand to the Geneva Institutions. Should this attitude be retained it will be of primary importance for the entire subsequent development of European politics. It will in fact mean Russia's return to European politics which would result in the liquidation of abnormal situations in Europe and in the collaboratio between Soviet Russia and Europe. Without a good solution of this situation one cannot hope for normal politics and the creation of a true balance of power between the European powers. As I stated in 1931 our international situation cannot and will not be decided as long as Russia has not taken full possession of her strength and duties and to a full and normal degree will play her part in the politics of the continent and especially in that of Central Europe. It has to be emphasized that this development has been prepared rath methodically under the preceding French governments. The question was then raised under Tardieu and Laval. Mr. Herriot worked hardest for this policy and Mr. Paul-Boncour has deliberately and expressly counted upon this element in his policy of the last months.

H0681-0049

The present government is aware of this new situation and has progressed in this direction.

Copy certified by:

Dr. Frhr. v. Luedinghausen

Attorney-at-law and Notary.

H0681-0050

Filed July 21 1946

Neurath No.82

Defense Exhibit No.

Proclamation in favor of total military training. From the speech of the Minister of War, Marshal Petain, delivered on 22 July 1934 in St.Malo before the National League of Reserve Officers.

(Quoted from:"Contemporary World History in Documents", Part 1, 1934/35, page 394 (17 5))

Filed July 21 1946 No. 82

H0681-0051

Proclamation for Full Military Training

From the speech of the Minister of War Marshal Petain, delivered on 22 July 1934 in St. Malo before the National Association of Reserve Officers.

We neglect pre-military training far too much, and yet during the debate in 1927 on the introduction of one year's military service no doubt was left that one should intensify the military training of the youth in order to make up for the short training period.

This assurance has in no way been followed up. We always keep only the current class of recruits under the colors. The recruits join their units without previous training and we are compelled to sacrifice weeks, indeed even months, for the rudiments of military training which is made so immensely difficult through the complex nature of modern war material. And what gaps remain! How inadequate is the training of the non-commissioned officers who leave for the reserve with hardly more than a rudimentary knowledge.

If we want to keep within the frame-work of the existing defense law we have to try to remedy the situation by increasing the financial means available to the organizations for pre-military training, by increasing the number of young men fit for training and by attempting to find a bold and new solution for all these problems.....

What is important for us Frenchmen at a time in which the world resounds from the boldest attempts? To preserve our ideals and our heritage which we have rebuilt after incredible afflictions. With dignity we want to preserve the peace which righted wrong, the peace our 1,500 000 dead have fought for.

(Quoted from "Contemporary World History in Documents part 1, 1934/35, p.394 (17

Copy certified by:

Dr. Frhr. v. Luedinghausen
Attorney-at-Law and Notary.

H0681-0052

Filed July 21 1946

Neurath No.83

Defense Exhibit No....

Germany and the Events of

25 July 1934

Communique of the German Reich Government of 26 July 1934.

(Quoted from :" Contemporary World History in Documents "

Part I.1934/35, page 265)

H0681-0053

No. 83

Germany and the Events of 25 July 1934

Communique of the German Reich Government of 26 July 1934.

It appears from statements made by the Vienna radio station and/or official Austrian information agencies that between the Austrian insurgents and the Austrian Government an agreement has been reached on a free departure of the insurgents to Germany. This agreement concerns in no way the German Government and does not legally bind it in any way. The German Government has, therefore, issued an order to arrest the insurgents at once in case of their crossing the German frontier.

The German ambassador in Vienna, Rieth, at the request of the Austrian Government and/or of the Austrian insurgents has agreed to give his consent to an agreement between those two parties, as to the free conduct and departure of the insurgents to Germany, without previous consultation with the German Government. He was thereupon immediately recalled from his post.

(Quoted from:" Contemporary World History in Documents, Part I, 1934/35)

H0681-0054

Filed June 27, 1946

Neurath No.64 87

Defense Exhibit No ....

A Letter from the Defendant C.Baron v. Neurath to the Ministerial Director Dr. Koepke of 28 July 1934.

H0681-0055

. . . . . .

However, the development of the Austrian events cannot be foreseen yet. It seems to me, nevertheless, that due to quick acting the acute danger has been warded off. Of course, that implies that greatest cautiousness has to be observed for the time being.

H0681-0056

and with that in mind I worked yesterday to on the Reich Chancellor. I found full understanding, I also mentioned Rieth's difficult position with the result, that both Hitler and Goebbels asked me not to hold his conduct against h

H0681-0057

filed July 1946

Neurath No.85

Defense Exhibit No.

Communiqué of the German Reich Government of 10 September 1934 regarding its attitude towards the East Pact.

(Quoted from : " Contemporary World History in Documents " 1934/35, Part I, page 194)

H0681-0058

No. 85

As to the projected obligation of military assistance of the pact participants, the German Government has declared, that the realization of that idea related to the sanction stipulations of the League of Nation's Charter has so far met with unsurmountable difficulties at all international negotiations. Germany, whose central location amidst strongly armed nations forces her to particular caution, cannot take on any obligation which would drag her into any potential conflict in the East, making her the probable theatre of war.

There is no real political necessity for the special guarantees by France and the Soviet Union, foreseen in the pact system. At any rate Germany cannot expect any advantages for herself from such guarantees.

The German Government believes that other methods for the safeguarding of peace promise better results. In general it would prefer bilateral treat It does not reject , however, multilateral treaties. But the main emphasis should not be placed on the automatic obligation of military assistance in case of war but on the obligation of non-aggression and on the obligation having/ a consultation among the powers interested in the conflict. These obligations could very well be transformed into real peace guarantees in the sense of preventive measures against war, without any danger of serious complications, which would be bound to follow the assistance pact now proposed by the other power.

H0681-0059

Filed July 1946

Neurath N..86

Defense Exhibit No.

Speech by the Reich Minister of Foreign Affairs Baron von Neurath of 17-9-1934 at the International Traffic Convention.

(Quoted from: "Contemporary World History in Documents" 1934/35 Part I, pp. 74-77

No. 86

..... .

In general, is it not political nonsense, to make concrete statement on what a government may intend to do in the field of foreign politic in the next 10 or more years! And does not the only real possibility for preparing the preservation of peace also for a distant future consist of handling the acute problems of today with understanding, honestly trying to settle the tensions now existing. Fartherreaching general and abstract systems may be likely, as I mentioned previousl to advance certain ideologies and also to disguise certain special quite realistic and political tendencies. As a rule, they are in our opinion of no value to the safeguarding of universal peace.

When one year ago the Reich Government decided to withdraw from the League of Nations, it did not, as I want to repeat it to you today, do it because it wanted to obtain greater political elbow room or because it was averse to political collaboration with the other powers. It simply happened because the necessary foundation for such collaboration, the equality of rights, was missing. Of course, it was not only a question of word or theory, but of political practice. We also reaffirm our viewpoint, which is decisive for a discussion of our eventual return into the League of Nations. This is in no way a viewpoint of unilateral special interests. Germany is surely not alone of the opinion that the Institution of the League of Nations ha been rocked to its very foundations by its complete failure in the disarmament question. It is certainly also a significant symptom

H0681-0060

H0681-0061

that today, with the crisis over the important question of minorities, closely connected with the Versailles Treaty, a new dangerous fissure can be noticed in the Geneva edific. We believe that drastic reforms are needed to reshape the League of Nations into [illegible] what its Charter meant it to be, a really workable instrument for peace.

.....

.....

I frankly admit not being able to discern any favorable symptom in the way the affairs of European politics are frequently being handled at present with methods of downright precipitating pact ideas of various kinds, methods which not unreasonably could be called pact mania. The salvation of Europe cannot possibly lie in alliances and in the regrouping of powers, according to varying conditions. Political trends running along such lines are only proof of the increasingly clearer shortcomings of the political system forced upon Europe by the treaties of 1919. It is dangerous in the long run and

H0681-0062

and futile to try to hide these shortcomings instead of acknowledging and frankly admitting them. As long as one lacks courage to face unavoidable facts and necessities and to look for an adjustment of conflicting interests through frank discussions from state to state on the basis of mutual respect and equality of rights, an improvement of general political conditions is unthinkable.

H0681-0063

Filed June 24, 1946

Neurath No. ~~67~~ 87

Defense Exhibit No.

The Admission of the Soviet Union to the League of Nations.

Recommendation by the Political Committee of the League of Nations: Decision of the League of Nations Assembly of 18 September 1934.

(Quoted from "Contemporary World History in Documents"
1934/35 Part I, Page 215)

H0681-0064

filed July 21 1946

Neurath No. 88

Defense Exhibit No.....

---

recommends to the assembly, that the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics be admitted to the League of Nations.

H0681-0065

Neurath No. 88

Defense Exhibit No.

Excerpt from General Smuts' speech of 12 November 1934 delivered before the Royal Institute of International Affa

(Quoted from: "Contemporary World History in Documents", 1934/35. Part I pages 84-85, 87-88, 89-90)

H0681-0066

Filed July 2, 1946

Defense Exhibit No. 88

Excerpts from General Smuts'speech of 12 November 1934 delivered before the Royal-Institute of International Affairs.

.....

.....Conditions are quite different today from what they were in 1914. At that time, war in the near future meant a given policy, for which the old empires prepared themselves feverishly. They all had their "day" towards which the general staffs looked forward greedily. Today, nobody wants a war; every statesman knows that it means the ruin of his own country and his own end. With perhaps one exception, there is no nation prepared today for war, and war simply means interior revolution. And even in the exceptional case I have mentioned, the people itself is today definitely peaceful. Not the military but the economic front fills the thoughts of statesmen. Today we are constantly told about what is going on the other side of the Rhine, about the secret armaments, about the training, and about the preparations. All this might be true, and a large part of it must be true; but it is probably nothing but the result of an inferiority complex. It is not real militarism, but military stimulants for the masses. This wild behavior creates a ratifying feeling of satisfaction and of relief in those who consider themselves as inferior or as being humiliated by their neighbors on the other side of the Rhine. The true war-crazy spirit is something different and an entirely different phenomenon. It is possible that it will revive, if we are so unwise as to let things go on, but for the moment it is buried under the ruins of the 11th of November 1918. To tell me that the German people really desires and is consciously preparing for war, would be to try to make me believe that the German people is crazier than any other people could ever be today. Let us stop this senseless war babble, whose pernicious purpose will make it turn sooner or later to facts.

.....

Up to now I have only considered the complex of fear and how it is to be treated. The other, the inferiority complex, is closely connected with it- just as the mentalities of victor and vanquished are closely connected. If we desire peace, there is little use in our bothering with the one unless at the same time we cope courageously with the other. There is no sens in piling up sanctions in order to drive away fear, if at the same time one does not strike the inferiority complex at its root. Fear increases in proportion as the inferiority complex gets inflamed and becomes more threatening. On the other hand, the inferiority complex becomes more and more inflamed, as the fear complex arms itself with defensive weapons. They strengthen and complement each other mutually, and both, together lead a policy of renewed armament for defense. Thus, if one does not tackle both one goes on turning in the vicious circle of the two complexes and of increasing rearmament. Unless both complexes are healed, I am afraid that the disarmament policy will continue to suffer the same set-back it has suffered up to now. It is simply a question of cause and effect. Germany's deliverance from its inferiority complex is as important for future peace as the elimination of the fear complex from the mind of France and both together are deciding factors in an efficient disarmament policy.

Now, how can one do away with the inferiority complex which has overcome Germany and which, I am afraid, poisons its thoughts and, indeed, even its soul? There is only one way which consists of recognizing its complete equality of rights with

the other nations, and to do it frankly, voluntarily and without any restriction. This is the only cure for its disease. And if we have gathered enough courage to treat it in this humane way as having equal rights in the community of nations, then and only then, the old wound will cease to run and to poison the life of Europe and the world. As long as it is denied recognition of its position with equal rights, it will remain embittered by consciousness of the misery and injustice it has suffered. That is absolutely human, and just because it is a human situation we should meet it with intelligence and courage. Even if one understands and sympathizes with French apprehensions, one cannot help sympathizing with Germany and the inferior position it holds, 16 years after the end of the war. The maintenance of the provision in the treaty of Versailles is developing into an offense against the European conscience and into a danger for future peace. There must be sufficient human sympathy left in Europe to make us admit that the situation has become unendurable and a public danger. International law does not recognize any second class nations, and the last thing to do to keep Germany in such a position half a generation after the end of the World War. Fair play and true sportsmanship, indeed, all the standards one applies to public and private life demand a revision of the situation. Indeed, the most elementary intelligence makes it imperative. Let us break the chains and free the captive, possessed soul in a decent human way, and Europe will reap her reward in the form of calm security and returning relief. Germany's equality of rights has already been granted in principle. This was in December 1932, when the major powers participating in the disarmament conference decided to grant Germany " equality of rights in a regime of security ". If this declaration had been followed and people had acted accordingly during the conference, today Germany would still be a member of the League of Nations and not a disturbing factor outside it, and according to all probability we would have arrived at an agreement covering far-reaching disarmament measures. Now it stands outside the League of Nations, its armament situation is veiled in obscurity and surrounded by dangers, and the occasion for general disarmament measures seems to be farther off than ever before. It is like the story of the sibylline books. The circle of the two complexes and of increasing rearmament is closing in ever more tightly about Europe. Let us hasten to loose the knot and to free the gentle genius of European civilization from those chains again which in the future might strangle Europe. The appeal addressed to Europe to put its house in order and not to allow momentary trends and complexes to become chronic, is becoming more and more imperative. We dare not leave to the coming generation the legacy of a state of chronic disorder which might be more than it can endure. The suffering, fearful nations of Europe filled with their worries about the future, turn with raised hands to their political leaders, asking for wise guidance and courageous leadership. It is too much to hope that under good leadership a new atmosphere will even now be created and a new situation set up which will bring back the more hopeful prospects we had over a year ago. In such a friendly atmosphere we could pick up the threads again which at that time were so forcibly torn asunder. Just now a really great gesture could help to dispel the complexes of fear and inferiority and make possible a fresh start in European relations and even a promising resumption of the disarmament negotiations. Europe can still be steered towards calmer waters and towards an area of friendly cooperation. I emphasize that time is marching on, and that what has to be done must be done rapidly. Germany declared towards the end of the past year that if equality of rights were granted it in principle, it would be ready to make such practical reductions in its armaments, that they would present no danger to its neighbors. In view of its rearmament these specified proposals for defense

H0681-0068

as is admitted on the part of competent authorities, at least in England, offered a not unreasonable basis for discussion. Why must such a great opportunity for ensuring the peace of Europe and for making a fresh star in European cooperation be thrown overboard so frivolously? However shocking the principles of national-socialism might be for many other western nations, there is still no reason why Germany's international position with equal rights should not be recognized, and the moral disquietude which is at the root of national-socialism be eliminated. Despite its communism, Russia has been at last welcomed in the circle of the League of Nations. The necessity of recognizing Germany's international status with equal rights appears to be no less imperative, whatever the nature of its interior political system.

(Quited from: "Contemporary World History in Documents" 1934/35 Part

Pages 84 to 85, 87 to 88, 89 to 90.

.....

Certified true copy

Dr. Frhr. v. Luedinghausen
Attorney-at-Law and Notary.

H0681-0069

Filed June 24, 1946

Neurath No. 89
Defense Exhibit No.....

Declaration of 23 November 1934 made by the reporter of the military affairs committee of the French Chamber concerning the entente with Russia

(Quoted from: " Contemporary World History in Documents" 1934/35 Part I, page 220)

Neurath No. 89

Defense Exhibit No.

Declaration of 23 November 1939 made by the reporter of the Military affairs committee of the French Chamber concerning the entente with Russia.

If we consider the European situation, we see that (since his accession to power) Herr Hitler has tried) to drive Russia's antagonists, first Poland and Japan, against the Soviet Union.

In their knowledge that peace was endangered, Russia and France desired to preserve their security. Does a military agreement exist between these two great nations or is it simply a close association ? It is undeniable that such an entente does exist, and it is a formal entente. It is not up to me to say whether this entente, this relationship represents an alliance. Only the French government could say that.

However, I consider it useful to state that in the present day circumstances, nothing but the formal union and full entente between France and Russia, makes Europe stable and peace a certainty/.

For the preservation of its security Russia disposes over a large-sized, well-equipped and well-trained army, which it offers to France in case of a conflict with Germany.

There can be no objection to the fact that France, which is considered a bourgeois country is at this moment making an alliance with the Union of the Socialist Soviet Republics. We have in view primarily the security of our country, the calm of Europe and the establishment of a complete and lasting peace.

We feel a double satisfaction. First as Frenchmen, because this close association and formal entente guarantees our security; and secondly, because at the present moment this is the only means of stabilizing Europe and making peace a certainty.

I believe that the Russian air force is the first in Europe, and that the French comes immediately after, and I believe that as there exists a close relationship between Russia and France - I do not use the word alliance - we can relax for the time being: the cause of peace is safeguarded.

(Quoted from: "Contemporary World History in Documents" 1934/5 Part I, pages 220 to 221)

Certified true copy

.....

Dr. Frhr. v. Luedinghausen

Attorney-at-Law and Notary

H0681-0070

H0681-0071

Neurath No. 91....

Defense Exhibit No.....

Filed June 24, 1946

French-Russian Protocol of the East Pact Negotiations, 5 December 1934

(Quoted from: Disarmament and Security" by Dr. K. Schwendemann, Volume 2, Pages 771 to 772)

H0681-0072

Neurath No. 91

Defense Exhibit No.....

French-Russian Protocol of the East Pact Negotiations

Geneva, 5 December 1934

The French Foreign Minister and the Soviet People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs have had an exchange of ideas at Geneva, concerning the status of the negotiations carried on to effect the conclusion of the East Pact for which their governments had taken the initiative, and have come to the conclusion that the two governments are both decided to urge the conclusion of the international act contemplated. At the moment where the negotiations have taken a more active turn, they have agreed upon taking the following position in the name of their governments:

1.) Neither of the two governments will enter into negotiations, with the governments which are requested to participate in the East Pact, and especially with those which have not yet declared their desire to join in principle, which could lead to the conclusion of bilateral or multi-lateral treaties, which could compromise the preparation or the conclusion of the regional East Pact or the treaties connected with it or which would be in contradiction to the spirit from which they have sprung.

H0681-0073

Neurath No. 92
Defense Exhibit No.....

Appeal to the Army Delivered on 28 December 1934 by the President of the Czechoslovakian Republic Masaryk.

(Quoted from: "Contemporary World History in Documents" 1934/35 Part I, Page 440.)

H0681-0074

Neurath No. 92

Defense Exhibit No.

Appeal to the Army Delivered on 28 December 1934 by the President of the Czechoslovakian Republic Masaryk.

.....

Soldiers !

Conditions abroad have compelled the Czechoslovakian Republic to introduce the two year military service. This is merely a security measure. It permits to increase the army's efficiency, it allows for higher promotions within the armed forces and guarantees the security of the country.The soldiers on active service have an extraordinary significance and importance for the protection of the country. The great development and progress of aeronautics and of the motorization of the army make it much easier than ever for the enemy today to carry out a surprise attack,to penetrate into enemy territory, to destroy plants and depots, to create confusion and panic. The soldiers on active service stand on guard against similar sudden attacks and disorder. The greater the danger of a surprise attack, the greater, the more solid and the more watchful the guards of the nation and its security measures must be. Only for this reason 2 years of military service has been introduced.

H0681-0075

Filed June 24, 1946

Neurath No.94

Defense Exhibit No.....

Excerpt from the French Prime Minister Flandin's Speech of 5 Feb. 1935 before the Chamber.

(Quot.from: "Contemporary World History in Documents" Part I Page 107. 1934/35)

H0681-0076

Filed June 24, 1946

Neurath No. 95
Defense Exhibit No.....

The Reich Government's reply dated 14 February 1935 to the London Communique.

(Quoted from: "Contemporary World History in Documents" 1934/35 Part 1, page 109)

H0681-0077

Neurath No. 95
Defense Exhibit No. .....

The Reich Government's Reply dated February 14th, 1935

to the London Communique.

.....

The German Government concurs with the Royal British Government and the French Government in their sincere desire to work toward securing the peace in the interest of Germany's security as well as in the interest of the security of the other European countries. The German Government hails the spirit of confidential discussions to be carried on between individual governments, as expressed in the communication of the Royal-British and French Governments. It will thoroughly examine the entire complex of European questions contained in the first part of the London communique submitted to it. This shall be done in the spirit of earnest desire for world peace and concern for the security of the German Reich in its particularly exposed geographical situation in the heart of Europe. The German Government will especially try to find means to avoid in the future the danger of armament races which came into being when heavily armed nations desisted from disarming, as stipulated in the Treaty provisions. It is convinced that only free agreements between sovereign states, carried on in the spirit as expressed in the British-French communique, can lead to permanent international settlements in the field of armaments.

The German Government welcomes the suggestion to increase security against sudden air attacks by way of an agreement to be concluded as soon as possible which would consider a direct commitment of the air forces of the undersigned Governments in favor of the victim of an unprovoked air attack.

It is in principle ready to employ its air forces as a deterrent against attempts to disturb the peace. It is, therefore, inclined to find ways and means in free agreements with the Governments concerned for enacting a convention that will guarantee the greatest possible security for all the Undersigned.

The German Government is of the opinion that discussions carried on in a larger circle and not properly prepared are, as experience shows, quite naturally bound to bring on frictions, which should be avoided in the interest of concluding such air convention wholly novel in its consequences. Before the German Government takes part in such discussions, it considers it desirable to clarify a number of preliminary basic questions with the respective Governments at individual conferences. It would welcome it therefore, if - after the preliminary French-British consultations - first the Royal-British Government as participant in the London conference and as guarantor of the Locarno pact, would be ready to enter into a direct exchange of ideas on this subject with the German Government, also.

The German Government agrees with the Royal British and French Governments' view that the setting up of an air convention would mean an important step toward the solidarity of the European nations and that it could be instrumental in bringing about a solution to the other European problems, too, in a way satisfactory to all countries.

H0681-0078

.....

Copy certified by

(Dr. Frhr. v. Lüdinghausen)

Attorney-at-Law and Notary Public

H0681-0079

Filed June 24, 1946

Neurath No.96

Défense Exhibit No...

Declaration by the French Government

of 15 March 1935

(Quot. from : " Disarmament and Security " by

Dr. K. Schwendemann, Volume 2, pages 657-61)

H0681-0080

Under these circumstances and aware of its responsibility, the Government decided within the framework of the law of 31 March 1928 and in accordance with article 40 of this law, to keep the recruits otherwise to be discharged this coming April and October respectively, temporarily under the colors. The same decision will apply in regard to the contingent to be drafted until 1939 inclusive, unless relief measures can be taken owing to favorable developments in the negotiations concerning organization of security and limitation of armaments. The period of extension of service thus decided upon will be 6 months for those whose year of service terminates in April 1936, and one year for those following.

H0681-0081

Filed June 24, 1946

Neurath No. 97

Defense Exhibit No.

Excerpt from the Proclamation by the German Reich Government on the Reinstatement of Compulsory Military Service in Germany, dated 16th March 1935.

(Quoted from :" Contemporary World History in Documents " 1934 to 1935, Part 1, pp.118-121)

H0681-0082

Neurath No. 97
Defense Exhibit No.

Excerpt from the Proclamation of the German Reich Government on the Reinstatement of Compulsory Military Service in Germany, dated on 16 March 1935.

.....

For:

1.) Germany had disarmed.

2.) In the peace treaty it had been expressly laid down that Germany should be disarmed in order to create thereby a pre-condition for general disarmament, i.e. it was taken for granted that Germany's armament alone was the reason for the armament of other countries.

3.) Both in its governments as well as in its parties the German nation at that time held a point of view which corresponded entirely to the pacifist-democratic ideals of the League of Nations and its founders. While Germany, however, had fulfilled her obligations as one of the contracting parties the second party to the treaty failed to live up to its obligations. I.e.: The High Contracting Parties of the former Victorious Nations have unilaterally disengaged themselves from the obligations of the Treaty of Versailles!

It was not enough that no disarmament was undertaken comparable in any way to the German destruction of arms, - no, the process of arming was not even brought to a standstill. On the contrary, it finally became evident that quite a number of countries were rearming. Whatever had been invented during the war in the way of new engines of destruction was now perfected in peace time through methodical scientific research. In the field of mighty tank construction as well as of new fighter and bombing planes uninterrupted and terrible improvements were made. Now giant guns were built and new demolition, incendiary and gas bombs developed.

From that time onwards, the world resounded with war cries as if there had never been a world conflict and as if the Treaty of Versailles had never been made.
In the midst of these highly armed and warlike nations who were making increasing use of the most modern motorized weapons, Germany represented a power vacuum exposed defenselessly to every threat and to every menace on the part of any one of the nations. The German people remembers its unhappiness and suffering during 15 years of economic misery and political and moral humiliation.

It was therefore understandable that Germany should begin to press strongly for the fulfillment of the promise of disarmament given by the other nations. For it is clear that the world could not only stand a hundred years peace but it should be in fact an immeasurable blessing for it. It could not stand, however, a division into victors and vanquished which would last a hundred years. Feeling with regard to the moral justification and necessity of international disarmament was alive not only in Germany but also in many other nations. The pressure exerted by these forces gave rise to attempts at bringing about through conferences a decrease of armaments and thereby a general international re-adjustment on a lower level. Thus there came into existence the first proposals for international armament agreements of which we recall as important the MacDonald plan. Germany was willing to accept this plan and to make it a basis for forming agreements.
But owing to its rejection by other nations it failed and was finally abandoned. Since under such circumstances there was no fulfillment of the solemn promise of equal rights which had been given the German nation and Reich in the declaration of December 1932, the new German Reich Government as guardian of the German people's honor and right to live found itself unable to go on taking part in such conferences or to belong to the League of Nations. However, even after its withdrawal from Geneva the German Government was willing not only to examine proposals by other nations

but also to make practical suggestions of its own. It thereby adopted the point of view taken by the other nations themselves that the creation of armies with a short term of service was unsuited for purposes of aggression and was therefore to be recommended for peace time defense.
And so at the request of the other nations it declared itself willing to change the Reichswehr with its long term of service into an army with a short term of service. Its proposals in the winter of 1933/34 were practical and easy to carry out, and their rejection as well as the final rejection of the similarly designed Italian and English plans led to the conclusion that the other parties to the treaty were subsequently no longer willing to comply with the meaning of the disarmament terms of Versailles.
Under these circumstances the German Government felt obliged to take measures of its own which would guarantee the end of such a powerless and defenseless state in a great nation and Reich, a defenselessness which was as shameful as it was menacing in the long run.
In doing so it began with those same considerations which Minister Baldwin expressed with such truth in his last speech:

"A country which is unwilling to take the necessary precautionary measures for its own defense will never have power in this world, either moral or material

The government of the present German Reich, however, desires but one moral and material power, namely that which will enable it to safeguard peace for Germany and thus for the whole of Europe as well.

It has, therefore, continued to do everything in its power to promote peace.

1) A long time ago it offered to conclude pacts of non-aggression with all of the countries around it.

2) With its Eastern neighbor it has tried to find and has found a treaty settlement which, - it hopes -, thanks to the comprehension it has met with, will eliminate the poison found in the menacing atmosphere at the time this government took over power, and which will lead to a lasting understanding and friendship between the two nations.

3) Lastly it has given a solemn assurance to France that now the settlement of the Saar problem has been assured, Germany has no more territorial demands from France. It believes that with this great political and material sacrifice it has brought about in a manner rarely found in history the conditions for a settlement of a centuries old struggle between two great nations.

The German Government, however, regrets to note that for months there has been continually increasing rearmament on the part of the rest of the world. In the creation of a Soviet Russian Army of 101 divisions, i.e. an admitted peacetime strength of 960,000 men, it sees a factor which could not have been surmised at the time the treaty of Versailles was drafted.

In the enforcing of similar measures in other countries it sees further proof of a rejection of the idea of disarmament as it was proclaimed at one time. Far be it from the German Government to throw the blame on any particular nation. But it must note today that through the decision to introduce a two years' military service in France, the ideological basis for the creation of armies with a short term of service has been abandoned in favor of an organization with a long term of service. This, however, was once an argument used to get Germany to give up her Reichswehr.

Under these circumstances the German Government feels that it is impossible to delay any longer or even to conceal from the knowledge of the surrounding world measures which are necessary for the security of the Reich.

If it, therefore, conforms now to the wish for a clarification of German intentions as expressed on 28 November 1934 in the speech of the English Minister Baldwin this is done for the following reasons:

1) In order to convince the German people and inform other nations that the task of guarding the honor and security

H0681-0083

of the German Reich rests from now on again upon the German nation's own strength;

2) In order that by fixing the extent of the German measures all truth may be taken from the statement that the German nation is striving for military hegemony in Europe. What the German Government desires as guardian of the honor and the interests of the German nation is to guarantee the extent of those instruments of power which are required not only to preserve the integrity of the German Reich but also to ensure international respect for Germany and her being looked upon as a co-guarantor of a general peace.

Before the German people and before the entire world the German Government is renewing now the assurance of its determination never to go beyond the guarding of German honor and the freedom of the Reich. It declares especially that it does not want to make out of the German national rearmament an instrument of military aggression but rather exclusively an instrument of defense and thereby of the preservation of peace. In this connection the German Reich Government expresses the confident hope that the German people having thus found its way back to its honor, may be permitted in independence and equality of rights to contribute its share to the preservation of world peace in free and sincere cooperation with the other nations and their governments.

(Quoted from :" Contemporary World History in Documents ", 1934/35, Part 1, pp.118-121)

Copy certified by :

Dr.Frhr.v.Luedinghausen
Attorney-at-Law and Notary

H0681-0084

Filed June 24, 1946

Neurath No.98

Defense Exhibit

Communique of the German Reich Government of 18 March 1935.

(Quoted from: "Contemporary World History in Documents", 1934/35 Part 1, P.125)

H0681-0085

H0681-0086

Neurath

Communique of the German Reich Government of 18 March 1935.

This afternoon the British Ambassador Sir Eric Phipps called on the Reich Minister of Foreign Affairs and handed him the note which contained reestablishment of the Wehrmacht of 16 March. At the end of this note the question is asked again whether the Reich Government would be willing to discuss the points contained in the London communique on the occasion of the visit of Sir John Simon in Berlin. The Reich Minister answered this question in the affirmative.

(Quoted from: "Contemporary World History in Documents" 1934/35, Part I, p. 125.

Copy certified by:

Dr. Frhr. v. Lüdinghausen
Attorney-at-Law and Notary

H0681-0087

Filed June 24, 1946

Neurath No. 99

Defense Exhibit No...

Communique of 26 March 1935 on the Discussion of the English Foreign Secretary Sir John Simon, Lord Privy Seal Eden with the German Reich Government.

(Quoted from: "Contemporary World History in Documents", 1934/35, Part I, page 131)

H0681-0088

Neurath No..9.9.....

Defense Exhibit No...

Communique of 26 March 1935 on the discussions between the English Foreign Secretary Sir John Simon, Lord Privy Seal Eden and the German Reich Government.

.....

The German- English discussions between the English Foreign Secretary Sir John Simon , Lord Privy Seal Mr.Anthony Eden on one hand and the Fuehrer and Reich Chancellor and the Reich Foreign Minister Freiherr von Neurath on the other which took place in the presence of the British Ambassador Sir Eric Phipps and the Commissioner for Armament Problems Mr.von Ribbentrop during the last two days, were concluded this evening.

The questions dealt with were those which were listed in the London Communique of 3 February. The conversations took place in the most frank and friendly manner and led to a complete clarification of the mutual opinions.

It was established that with their policy both governments pusue the aim of securing and strengthening Europe's peace by promoting international co-operation.

The English and German ministers are convinced of the usefulness of direct discussions as have just taken place. Tomorrow Sir John Simon will return from Berlin to London by air, Mr.Eden will, according to plans, go on to Moscow, Warsaw and Prague.

(Quoted from :" Contemporary World History in Documents " 1934/35,Part I pages 131-132.)

H0681-0089

Filed June 24, 1946

Neurath No. 101
Defense Exhibit No.....

The Franco-Russian Pact of Assistance of 2 May 1935.
(Quoted from: "Disarmament and Security" by Dr. K. Schwendemann, Volume 2, pages 773 - 778.)

H0681-0090

Neurath No. 10.1

Defense Exhibit No.....

The Franco-Russian Pact of Assistance.

.....

Article I

In case France or the Union of the Socialist Soviet Republics should become object of a threat of attack or of a danger of attac by a European country, the Union of the Socialist Soviet Republics and France mutually bind themselves to enter into prompt consultation with each other on the measures to be taken for complying with the provisions of article 10 of the statute of the League of Nations.

Article 2

In case France or the Union of the Socialist Soviet Republics should become object of an unprovoked attack by a European country according to the provisions of article 15 par.7 of the statute of the League of Nations despite the sincerely peaceful intentions of both countries, the Union of the Socialist Soviet Republics and France will immediately render mutual help and assistance.

Article 3

Whereas according to article 16 of the statue of the League of Nations every member of the League starting a war contrary to the obligations accepted in articles 12, 13 or 15 of the statute, will ipso facto be regarded as having committed an act of war against all other members of the League, France and the Union of the Socialist Soviet Republics

H0681-0091

(Pages 773 - 778)

mutually bind themselves to render immediately mutual help and assistance by acting in accordance with article 16 of the statute, if one of them, under these conditions and despite sincerely peaceful intentions of both countries, should become the object of an unprovoked attack by a European country.

The same obligation is accepted in case that France or the Union of the Socialist Soviet Republics should become the object of an attack by a European country according to the conditions provided for in article 17, par. 1 and 3 of the statute of the League of Nations.

H0681-0092

Filed June 2nd, 1946

Neurath No. 102
Defense Exhibit No.

Communique of 15 May 1935 on the discussion of the French Foreign Minister Laval in Moscow.

(Quoted from: "Contemporary World History in Documents", 1935/36, 3rd Volume, page 295.)

H0681-0093

Neurath No. 102.

Defense Exhibit No. .....

Communique of 15 May 1935 on the discussion of the French Foreign Minister Laval in Moscow.

....

Above all, it is their duty to weaken in no way the means of their national defense in the interest of maintaining peace itself. In this respect Mr. Stalin understands and approves to the full extent the policy of national defense which France pursues in order to keep her armed power on the level which guarantees her security.

.....

H0681-0094

Neurath No. 103

Defense Exhibit No. ....

The Czech-Russian Pact of Assistance of 16 May 1935.

(Quoted from: "Disarmament and Security" by Dr. K. Schwendemann, Volume 2, pages 779 - 783)

H0681-0095

Neurath No. 103

Defense Exhibit No.

The Czecho - Russian Pact of Assistance

I. Treaty

on Mutual Assistance between the Union of the Socialist Soviet Republics and the Czecho-Slovakian Republic,

. . . . . .

Article I

In case the USSR or the Czecho-Slovakian Republic should be the object of a threat of attack or of a danger of attack, the Czecho-Slovakian Republic and the USSR bind themselves to enter immediately a mutual consultation on the measures to be taken in complying with the provisions of article 10 of the statute of the League of Nations.

Article 2

In case the USSR or the Czecho-Slovakian Republic should be the object of an unprovoked attack by any European country under the provisions of article 15 par. 7 of the statute of the League of Nations despite the sincerely peaceful intentions of both countries, the Czecho-Slovakian Republic and the USSR will immediately render each other help and assistance.

Article 3

Whereas according to article 15 of the statute of the League of Nations every member of the League starting a war contrary to the obligations accepted in articles 12,13, and 15 of the statute will ipso facto be regarded as having committed an act of war against all other members the League.

H0681-0096

The USSR and the Czecho-Slovakian Republic bind themselves to render immediate mutual assistance and help by acting in accordance with article 16 of the statute in case one of them should be the object of an unprovoked attack by any European country under these conditions and despite the sincerely peaceful intentions of both countries.

The same obligation is accepted for the case the USSR or the Czecho-Slovakian Republic should be the object of an attack by a European country according to the conditions stipulated in article 17 par.1 and 3 of the statute of the League of Nations.

H0681-0097

Filed June 24, 1946

Neurath No.104

Defense Exhibit No....

From the speech by the Fuehrer and Reich Chancellor Adolf Hitler on May 21st 1935 concerning the Russian-French Pact.

(Quot. from :" Contemporary World History in Documents 1934/35 Part 1, Page 243)

Moreover, in the assistance pact, which is by now well known to us, we see a development which is in no way different from the structure of former military alliances. We regret this particularly for the reason that through the military alliance concluded between France and Russia what is no doubt the only clear and really valuable bilateral security pact in Europe, namely the Locarno Pact, - an element of legal uncertainty is brought into. Interpellations pertaining to legal obligations arising from this new alliance, as expressed recently on different hands, and very likely from similar apprehensions, show by the questions they put as well as by the replies, how numerous are the cases which may occur and bring about differenc of opinion. The German Reich Government would be particularly grateful for an authentic interpretation of the reactions and effects of the Russian-French military alliance on the treaty obligations of the individual parties to the Locarne Pact. She also wishes to leave no doubt as to her own opinion that she considers these military alliances incompatible both with the spirit and the letter of statutes of the League of Nations.

(quot.from: Contemporary World
History in Documents" 1934/35
Part 1 Page 243 to 247)

H0681-0098

H0681-0099

Filed June 2nd, 1946

Neurath No.105

Defense Exhibit No.....

The Reichsregierung's Note dated May 25, 1935, directed to the Signatory Powers to the Locarno Treaty.

(Quot.from: "Contemporary World History in Documents" 1935/36, 3, Volume, page 296)

At first glance it appears that the new French-Soviet Treaty in its regulations concerning mutual obligations of assistance by both signatories against Germany adapts itself to the exceptions mentioned under a) and b). Article 2 provides for the obligatory assistance in such a case as mentioned under article 15, par.7 of the League of Nations Charter and article 3 holds such a provision for an event as mentioned under article 16 of the Leage of Nations Charter. To both these cases are added the instance of art. 17 par.1 and 3 of the League of Nations Charter not mentioned in the Rhine Pact of Locarno, which on its part provided for the application of art.16 under certain circumstances against a countr not a member of the League of Nations.

These are the regulations referring to art.16 and 17 of the new League of Nations Charter that call for special attention on the part of the Signatiories to the Rhine Pact. It brings up the serious question for these Powers whether the treaty obligations which France took upon herself with regard to the USSR are in keeping with the limitations set down by the Locarne Pact. Accordi to the point of view of the German Government, in answering this question, the supplementary agreements are of decisive importance which the two Signatories to the Treaty accepted under number 1 of the Official Protocol.

It says under this article: It is understood that the effect of the third Article is to compel each of the contracting parties to immediately render assistance to the other one in immediate compliance with the recommendations of the Council of the League of Nations as soon as they will have been issued by virtue of Article 16 of the Agreement. It is also understood that both contracting parties shall act

H0681-0100

H0681-0101

together in order to achieve that the Council issue its recommendations with all the speed required by the circumstances and that, if the Council for some reason does not issue any recommendation or if it does not come to an unanimous vote, the obligation of assistance shall nevertheless become effective.

The formulation of this regulation indicates that although the two Signatories to the Treaty intend to call on the Council of the League of Nations before taking some action to be supported by art.16 of the League of Nations Charter, they are also determined to fulfill the assistance obligations agreed on if for some reason there is no recommendation on the part of the Council to that effect or they do not find any unanimous Council decision at all. There is no interpretation other than that France wishes to avail herself of th liberty, in case of a conflict between Germany and the USSR, to take armed action against Germany, based on art.16 of the League of Nations Charter, when she can neither refer to a recommendation nor to some other decision by the Council of the League of Nations. It is Germany's view that an armed action initiated under such circumstances constitutes a disregard of article 16 of the League of Nations Charter and consequently a flagrant violation of the Rhine Pact of Locarno.

Filed June 24, 1946

Neurath No.106

Defense Exhibit No. ...

Statement by the First Lord of the Admiralty Sir Bolton Eyres Monsell on the English Radio on 19th June 1935

(quot.from: "Disarmament and Security" by Dr.K.Schwendemann Vol.2, Page 764-67)

H0681-0102

(P.764 - 767)

Neurath No. 106.
Defense Exhibit No..

Statement by the First Lord of the Admiralty Sir Boltin Eyres Monsell on the English Radio on June 19th, 1935.

" The international treaties on which the building of fleets was based in recent years, will expire at the end of 1936. These treaties prevented both competition in naval armament and the ruinous expenditure connected with it, and since they afforded the same security to all countries concerned, they were a great contribution towards the maintenance of peace.
For these reasons the British Government is making serious efforts to bring about a new treaty in respect of a general limitation of fleets and for months we have been working at this. The difficulties in formulating such an agreement are tremendous. They are like a puzzle in which it has so far proved impossible to join the separate pieces together. Now, for the first time, we are in a position to fit two important pieces together and we believe that the good start will perhaps make it easier for us to join up the remaining pieces of this complicated problem. The speech made by the German Chancellor on May 21st, in which Germany declared its intention to limit its fleet voluntarily to 35% of the size of British member fleets, offered a decisive and concrete starting point for future fleet limitation. Consequently, we consider it an absolute necessity to discuss the proposal at the earliest possible moment with Germany's representatives in order to determine its full effect and exact meaning. Right after the beginning of the conferences which are still in progress as regards some of the questions, we came to the conclusion that the proposal is a contribution of the greatest importance in the matter of future fleet limitations, and that it would facilitate the signing of a general treaty in respect of the question of fleet limitations between all the naval forces of the world. We accepted it for this reason. The ratio of 35% is a permanent relation, that is, the German fleet will never exceed 35% of the British fleet strength, irrespective of whether or not these forces are limited by treaty. Thus, as far as Germany is concerned, the world is relieved of the fear of a new race for fleet armament. Germany will live up to this fleet ratio in spite of any new building which other nations may begin. It is this declaration by the German Government that makes the regulation so valuable a contribution to the general problem of fleet limitations. For it means that Germany will refrain from fleet armament competition not only with regard to England but with regard to other countries too, and we certainly hope that this statement will free the nation from all thoughts of new competition in the field of fleet building.
Germany has further consented to having the strength of her fleet determined by division into categories. This instant gives instant clarity and does away with the uncertainty that from a system of limitations based solely on total tonnage. Of course, in order to make a good working agreement, provisions are made for certain deviations in calculating the exact tonnage according to ship categories

results

H0681-0103

H0681-0104

The German Chancellor, who recognizes England's special naval responsibilities, has of his own accord limited the strength of the German fleet for all times to be 65% below the strength of the English fleet. The Admiralty is of the opinion that had England refused this proposal, it would have taken on a very heavy responsibility. It is convinced that in concluding this treaty, England has accomplished something which will prove to be a blessing not only to England but to all other countries as well, and which, circumstances permitting, will be a vital contribution in promoting peaceful relations throughout the entire world.

(Quoted from: "Disarmament and Security"
by Dr. K. Schwendemann
Volume 2, Page 764-767)

Certified a true copy:

Sgd. Freiherr von Luedinghausen
(Dr. Frh. von Luedinghausen)
Lawyer and Notary.